

### **REMARKS**

In the June 16, 2003 Office Action, all of the remaining claims 15-20 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

None of the claims are being amended by the current Amendment. Thus, claims 15-20 are pending, with claim 15 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication 2001-17040 to Kazuya Nanbu ("Nanbu patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,369,225 to Katsuhide Manabe et al. ("Manabe patent"). Claims 15-16 stand rejected over the Nanbu patent in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication 11-206284 to Mamoru Koike ("Koike patent"). Applicant believes that the Nanbu patent, the Manabe patent, and the Koike patent do not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 15 as filed.

Regarding the Nanbu patent, it discloses a fishing reel having a metal membrane 32 formed by metal plating on the surface of the finger protector 30. The Office Action acknowledges that the Nanbu patent fails to show a ground film-layer formed by a paint coat and a metal film layer providing a mirror effect and being formed semitransparently.

Regarding the Manabe patent, the Office Action asserts that a metal film layer providing a mirror effect is disclosed in column 3, lines 14-24, 30-43, 67-68, column 4, lines 1-3, and column 5, lines 1-20 of the Manabe patent. However, Applicant believes that the

Manabe patent teaches away from the semitransparent metal film layer, which is required by claim 15 as filed.

More specifically, claim 15 clearly requires that the metal film means be formed *semitransparently* on the ground film layer. Furthermore, as explained on page 2, line 31- page 3, line 14, the metal film of the present invention is required to have semitransparency such that the ground layer can be visually recognized, regardless of how thick the metal film layer is. (In fact, as stated on page 6, lines 22-30 of the specification, the film thickness of the metal film layer that will bring out a semitransparent mirroring effect will vary depending on various conditions such as the type of metal used, whether fine metallic powder is used or not). In this manner, the semitransparent mirroring effect can be obtained, by which patterns of the ground film layer show while the metallic mirrored surface also shows with the hue of the ground film layer. *See* page 3, lines 8-13 of the specification.

On the other hand, the Manabe patent concerns a method of furnishing flexible resinous articles with a metallic luster, as stated in column 2, lines 18-24. Therefore, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the film of the Manabe patent has a semitransparent mirroring surface. Furthermore, in column 6, lines 10-14, the Manabe patent clearly states that the thickness of the metal film should be at least than 150Å, because otherwise “*the coverage of the metal film is insufficient so that the substrate can be seen through the metal film.*” In other words, the Manabe patent clearly *teaches away from forming a semitransparent metal film layer*, contrary to the requirement of claims 15.

Applicant believes that, since the Manabe patent discourages forming a metal film layer that is semitransparent, the Manabe patent does not disclose or suggest the semitransparent metal film means required by claim 15. Therefore, Applicant believes that the Manabe patent cannot cure the deficiency of the Nanbu patent.

The Koike patent discloses a fishing reel having a metallic layer 14 that is formed by a metal plating process. The Office Action acknowledges that the Koike patent fails to show a ground film-layer formed by a paint coat and a metal film layer providing a mirror effect and being formed semitransparently. Thus, the Koike patent cannot cure the deficiency of the Nanbu patent, either singularly or in combination with the Manabe patent.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the Nanbu patent, the Manabe patent, and the Koike patent fail to anticipate or render obvious the arrangement of claim 15 as filed. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 15 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claims 16-20, they depend from claim 15, and are therefore narrower. Since claim 15 is believed to be allowable as discussed above, Applicant believes that claims 16-20 are also allowable over prior art of record.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 15-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Yoshio Miyagawa  
Reg. No. 43,393

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: Sep/12/03  
G:\09-SEP03-SMM\SN-US000640 Amendment.doc